

Date: Thu, 4 Aug 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #350
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 4 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 350

Today's Topics:

 Requirements for Licensing
 What is wrong with ham r
 What is wrong with ham radio (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 4 Aug 1994 02:39:45 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!
sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!F181-209.net.wisc.edu!
bmicales@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Requirements for Licensing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Before I start please let me male it clear that I do not wish to get into
any sort of "flame" war regarding CW, other modes of operations, etc. etc.
What follows is my personal opinion of how the licensing requirements should
be structured for Amateur Radio. I have been in Amateur Radio for about 18
years, so that will have some effect on this proposal:

| Class | Requirements | Privs. |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Novice | Novice Theory and Regs 5 wpm CW | HF novice and above 30MHz |
| Note: This would be a limited duration license - 2 year | | |
| Tech (no-code) | Novice, General, and | Above 30 MHz |

Advance Theory. Nothing
on HF operation, No Code

| | | |
|--------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Tech (coded) | Novice, and General Theory Novice HF operation, 5 wpm | Above 30 MHz plus Novice HF |
| General | Same as present | Same as present |
| Advanced | Same as present | Same as present |
| Extra | Same as present | Same as present |

If a tech (no-code) wished to upgrade to a higher class license (say to a General), than that person must pass the missing elements (HF regs, code requirement for that license class...General HF regs and code). For course, this is true for most upgrades :-).

Well, this is what I suggest. It takes what we have at present and only changes the Tech (no-code). Other modes of operation could be substituted (sp) for CW as time progress. However, what ever replaces CW should be measurable to indicate that persons proficiency in that mode of communications.

Ok, now I'll sit back and wait for your responses (if any) please just don't flame..this is just my opinion.

Thanks for your support and 73
de WA2DEU
Bruce Micales

Date: 4 Aug 1994 01:41:16 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!
ssd.intel.com!chnews!scorpion.@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: What is wrong with ham r
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <lenwink.139.000EC0B6@indirect.com>,
Len Winkler <lenwink@indirect.com> wrote:
>

>Not saying it's right, but Japan also signed the WARC treaty about needing
>CW for HF. However, they get around it with lower output wattage.
>73, Len, KB7LPW

Hi Len, it is my understanding that Japan follows the spirit of the

treaty, if not the letter, by prohibiting the HF no-coders from making contacts outside of Japan. We could take a lesson from those guys.

Like your show, 73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (Not speaking for Intel... but I'm sure Intel likes your show also. :-)

Date: Wed, 3 Aug 1994 07:35:18 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <paulf.775859725@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>brisa@ix.netcom.com (R. David Skillings) writes:
>
>>I have tried to obtain my HAM license for use aboard my boat while cruising.
>
>[...]
>
>>So, I have moved to a Marine Band SSB which does not require ANY testing.
>
>And therefore the system has worked as intended. Part 97 is quite clear about
>the use of Amateur Radio for purposes which another service exists. And,
>frankly, you're better off with the Marine SSB, since (Jeff will correct me
>if I'm wrong) The Coasties monitor it one heck of a lot more than they do the
>amateur "maritime mobile" frequencies.

True. The CG doesn't monitor 20M, or any other ham band. But they do monitor the 4, 6, 8, 12, 16, and 22 MHz high seas SSB and CW maritime frequencies day and night.

Of course, unofficially, during a quiet watch one the Collins receivers might be sitting on one of the ham bands - but we'd never think of firing up one of the 10kW transmitters on a ham band (hee hee).

Several CG radio stations have worked distress calls on 20M directly; but initially they'll get word over the telephone, not from monitoring 20.

Amateur radio is not supposed to compete with commercial services; thus a marine band radio to make your high seas phone calls *is* the proper radio to have aboard your boat.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 4 Aug 1994 01:34:26 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!lll-winken.llnl.gov!korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 78@amcomp.com, dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:
>jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>
>>In article <31etpq\$gpd@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@bigboy.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:
>>>There's more to SSB operation than just talking. For example, SSB
>>>operators need to properly operate their transmitters, and issues
>>>of proper drive level, linearity testing, etc., make sense to test
>>>on.
>>
>>So are you proposing this as a skill test for SSB? If so, we finally
>>agree on something! One country (which one?) has an examiner
>>present while the examinee tunes up and make a contact (under
>>the examiner's callsign, I suppose).

Whoa! Don't get carried away. Since it may not be practical to require people to actually operate a radio in the VE sessions, I'd likely implement such a test as a written exam. Anyway, who _tunes up_ radios anymore? :-).

The idea is to offer alternatives to the CW tests. A written exam with maybe 100 questions on practical radio operation, drawn from a pool of maybe 1200 questions, could easily be as challenging as learning 13 or 20 WPM CW. This should satisfy the "you have to work for it" crowd, and at the same time actually offer some value, by giving an amateur an incentive to learn some really useful things for advancing the state of the radio art.

>This makes a HELL of a lot more sense than morse decoding testing.
>
>Since FM voice is the most popular mode, how about requiring a new testee
>to make 3 or 4 repeater contacts. Or figure out how to change the offset
>on his HT.

As challenging as these things are, they're not really what I was thinking about. Determining the component values for a 2m PA matching network, given the equations and transistor specs, is more like.

>Are you FINALLY getting the point Jeff, RELEVANT testing. And NON
>exclusive pass/fail mode testing.

I'm not suggesting mode testing, Jeff is. However, relevant testing is a good idea; testing people on material relevant to advancing the state of the radio art, not preserving tradition, is very appealing.

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

*

Date: 3 Aug 1994 19:06:44 GMT

From: news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!scorpion.ch.intel.com!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wYwFkiubGQtN066yn@access.digex.net>, <31o977\$5bu@cat.cis.Bro,<wyn.91.2E3FC8C4@ornl.gov>.edu

Subject : Re: CW ...IS history!

>Since all of the hot developments and technical innovation in radio today
>are happening above 30mhz, why do all these non-code people need access
>to that segment below 30? After all, if its technical innovation they're
>interested in bringing to the hobby, they shouldn't *need* HF access
>anyway! MD

I, for one, would like to see some technical innovation on HF. After 40 years of the same old CW/SSB stuff, I am bored. With a 66MHz 486 and a 16-bit sound board, many digital modes should be possible without a TNC. Anybody working on anything like that?

73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (Not speaking for Intel)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #350
